

**U.S. Army Corps of Engineers  
Spring Valley Restoration Advisory Board Meeting  
St. David's Episcopal Church  
Minutes of the May 13, 2008 RAB Meeting**

| <b>RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS PRESENT AT THIS MEETING</b> |  |
|---|--|
| Mario Aguilar   | Community Member                                       |
| Greg Beumel   | Community Co-Chair                                     |
| Mary Bresnahan  | Community Member                                       |
| David Feary   | Community Member                                       |
| Steven Hirsh  | US EPA Region 3  |
| William Krebs   | Community Member                                       |
| Lawrence Miller   | Community Member                                       |
| Lee Monsein   | Community Member                                       |
| Malcolm Pritzker  | Community Member                                       |
| Dan Noble   | Military Co-Chair/USACE, Spring Valley MMRP Manager    |
| Ambassador Howard B. Schaffer                                     | Community Member                                       |
| Bernard Schulz  | American University                                    |
| Debra Thomas (filling in for J. Sweeney)                          | District of Columbia, Department of the Environment    |
| George Vassiliou  | Community Member                                       |
| Bert Weintraub  | Community Member                                       |
| John Wheeler  | Community Member                                       |
| <b>RESTORATION ADVISORY BOARD MEMBERS NOT PRESENT</b>             |  |
| Dr. Peter deFur   | Environmental Stewardship Concepts/RAB TAPP Consultant |
| George Vassiliou  | Community Member                                       |
| <b>ATTENDING PROJECT PERSONNEL</b>                                |  |
| Col. Peter Mueller  | USACE, District Commander                              |
| Mark Baker  | USACE, Site Historian                                  |
| Jeff Brewer   | USACE, Site Operations Officer                         |
| Joyce Conant  | USACE, Public Affairs Officer                          |
| Lan Reeser  | USACE, Project Team                                    |
| Maya Courtney   | ERT, Community Outreach Program                        |
| Carrie Johnston   | ERT, Community Outreach Program Manager                |

|  |                            |
|--|----------------------------|
| Tom Bachovchin                               | Parsons                    |
| Randall Patrick                              | Parsons                    |
| Jessica Bruland                              | Earth Resources Technology |
| <b>HANDOUTS FROM THE MEETING</b>             |                            |
| I. Final Agenda for the May 2008 RAB Meeting |                            |
| II. Handout of the USACE Presentation        |                            |
| III. Handout of the GIS Presentation         |                            |
|  |                            |

## **I. Administrative Issues**

### **A. Co-Chair Updates**

Greg Beumel, Community Co-Chair, welcomed the group and asked for updates from the RAB Task Groups.

### **B. RAB Task Group Updates**

No task group updates were presented.

## **II. Agenda**

### **A. Introduce Guests**

Debra Thomas, the DC Deputy Director of the Department of the Environment, is filling in for Jim Sweeney. Colonel Peter Mueller, the USACE Baltimore District Commander, is present to reaffirm USACE's commitment to Spring Valley.

Col. P. Mueller apologized for the Spring Valley siren malfunction that occurred on the night of May 8. He expressed his full confidence in his team and added that his team learned from this challenge, and they will ensure that even better communication occurs in the future. He monitors Spring Valley on a daily basis, and reviews reports and inquiries regarding the investigations. USACE is committed to three things:

- The daily safety of the community and the workers on site
- A thorough cleanup of the community
- Partnership with the community and all individuals involved with the Spring Valley FUDS site

### **B. Announcements**

#### **Global Green roundtable discussion**

The Spring Valley Partnership (EPA, DDOE, and USACE) were invited to attend a community-focused Global Green roundtable discussion on the Spring Valley FUDS project. Global Green USA is a national environmental organization that seeks to solve major environmental problems by integrating community-based projects, research, policy, and advocacy. The Partners will give a presentation on the Spring Valley project, followed by a discussion with the audience. A second roundtable focused on the Spring Valley health study is tentatively planned.

#### **Siren malfunction**

Dan Noble, Military Co-Chair, provided details on the siren malfunction that occurred on the night of Thursday, May 8, 2008 at 11:30 PM. An electrical surge occurred in the control panel during a period of

storm activity, and the guard on site immediately informed 911 and site personnel. The siren ran for approximately 25 minutes until the site manager arrived and disabled it at 11:55 PM. The on-site guard was unable to shut it off sooner because he did not have the required training or access to the command post trailer.

The standard siren warning sounds like an air-raid siren, with an ascending and descending tone. During the malfunction, the siren sounded an alternate tone that had not been set or tested. The siren warning length exceeded the preset time of 3 minutes, and continued until the site manager manually shut it down. In addition, the siren was louder than the preset volume, and it did not descend once it reached the peak volume.

Notifications were provided the next day through e-mails and website postings. A service technician ran a complete diagnostic on the siren, which appears to be fine. A new control panel was ordered in case the siren suffered damage. The back-up siren system is in place, and will be used until the Project Team members have full confidence that the new system is fully diagnosed.

The safety procedures for Pit 3 focused on activities and events occurring during operational hours. A guard is currently posted onsite 24 hours a day. Safety procedures for a maximum credible event were incorporated, and the siren provides a way to notify the community of an emergency. The possibility of an after-hours non-emergency event was overlooked in the planning process, and as a result of the siren malfunction, communication with the public during non-operational hours will be improved.

A phone number will be provided in case residents need to contact Project Staff after hours. This system will act as an after-hours answering service, where the operator can get in touch with a project member who will respond back to community members.

Officer McElwee of the District of Columbia Metropolitan Police Department (MPD) introduced himself and stated that the 2<sup>nd</sup> District officers responded to the 911 calls as priority calls. Upon arrival, the officers were notified that the siren was a false alarm, and they remained on site to ensure that the situation was cleared up and to answer questions from concerned residents.

Question from Ambassador Howard Schaffer, Community Member – Did the 911 callers associate the alarm with the Spring Valley project?

Officer McElwee was unsure as to the callers' impressions of the siren's source.

Question from Nan Wells, Audience Member and ANC3D Commissioner – Did the officers go directly to the site, or did they assume that the siren was a legitimate alarm?

Officer McElwee replied that the officers went immediately to the site because they were aware that a guard was stationed on-site. The officers relayed the false alarm information to responding units and remained on site until the site manager had turned off the siren.

Question from Kent Slowinski, Audience Member – Where did the site manager have to come from?

D. Noble replied that the site manager was staying in a hotel 6.5 miles from the site.

Question from Carrie Johnston, Project Team Member – Did any Spring Valley residents who are present this evening hear the siren?

Several residents heard the siren from as far away as Massachusetts Avenue and Sedgwick Street, but they did not associate it with the Spring Valley FUDS Site. The siren was also heard over on Overlook Road, where residents had not previously heard the siren during the monthly tests.

Ginny Durrin, Audience Member, said that she did not take the siren seriously, and she brought up a concern that other Spring Valley residents would not take it seriously either.

C. Johnston noted several residents in and near the Shelter-in-Place zone took the alarm sounding very seriously and said that at least one resident treated the alarm as an actual emergency and followed all steps according to the Shelter-in-Place protocol.

Ambassador H. Schaffer commented that the siren sounded so close to Rockwood Parkway that he called American University (AU) to find out whether they were the source. He said AU handled the situation well, with courtesy and with a commitment to locating someone with access to the source.

Mary Bresnahan, Community Member, not in the shelter-in-place zone, said that it sounded like the student car alarms and sirens that she is accustomed to, and that she had planned to report it to the police.

### III. USACE Topics

#### A. Geographic Information Systems (GIS) Presentation

Randall Patrick, Project Team Member, presented an introduction to the use of Geographic Information Systems (GIS) at Spring Valley.

GIS is a computer-based organized collection of hardware, software, and data that is designed to efficiently capture, manage, analyze, and display spatial information. This information is also referred to as geographically referenced information. The GIS software is used to create digital points of interest on a data layer. The data layer itself is simply a map, with linked tables of information that can be used to find out details about a particular object.

One way to obtain data for use in GIS is to digitize data collected during field surveys. A real-world object can be transformed into a data point in GIS by using the object's set of latitude and longitude coordinates. These real-world coordinates are transformed into digital coordinates by assigning them as a point entity on a GIS data layer. The GIS application knows where those real-world coordinates should be located spatially on the map.

For example, a polygon representing a house may be composed of four geographical coordinates, one for each corner of the house. When the coordinates for a house in Spring Valley are collected during a field survey, a data layer can be created that is devoted to the location of each house in Spring Valley.

Another way to capture data for use in GIS is to digitize data that is already present on an aerial photograph of the real world. The GIS software can be used to trace the boundaries, or mark the locations of certain points of interest. These boundaries and locations can then be used as a GIS data layer.

Two generic images were shown as an example. One was an **aerial photograph** that included buildings, roads, and a lake. The second **computer representation** showed the traced representations of the buildings, roads, and a lake on a GIS screen. Rectangular polygons represented buildings, lines represented roads, and an oddly-shaped polygon represented a lake. Labels were also placed on the data layer for easy identification of objects.

Real-world objects are represented by two types of data.

- Vector data (such as a house or a driveway) is created using points, lines, and polygons. Each data point represents a precise location associated with specific information (such as the materials used in construction).
- Raster data (such as an aerial photograph) is created using grids or cells. Each grid section or each cell represents a single value (such as average arsenic concentrations within that grid). Raster data is less precise than vector data.

R. Patrick showed the layout of the GIS application used in Spring Valley, called ArcView. The software creates a table of contents to display the available data layers. Most data layers are the point, line, and polygon vector data.

Once the GIS data is collected or created for Spring Valley, it is stored in four ways.

- Geodatabase – a personal geospatial database in MS Access that stores vector and raster data.
- Shapefiles – the original GIS file format for storing vector data (still used today)

- Computer Aided Design (CAD) files – files from detailed engineering drawings and surveys (this data is usually incorporated into the geodatabase whenever it is needed)
- Graphics – items such as text and labels that are stored in individual maps (these are not spatially-referenced, but they can be stored as vectors in a geodatabase)

A variety of data layers, derived from many sources, are used for the Spring Valley FUDS site.

- Base layers are digitally created from aerial surveys, and include basic information such as roads, buildings, and property lines.
- Environmental layers are incorporated from data collected in the field, and include sampling locations, sampling grids, and geophysical anomalies.
- Historic layers are created from historic aerial photographs, historic maps, and photogrammetry (information gleaned from historic photographs) conducted by EPA's Environmental Photographic Interpretation Center (EPIC).
- Modern and historic imagery (typically aerial photos)

The details for a particular object represented on a GIS data layer can be accessed using its attribute table. Each object has an associated attribute table, which is linked to the geodatabase. An unlimited amount of information can be stored in these tables. For example, the attribute table for a house may include the address, the owners' names, the year the house was built, and the construction materials.

In Spring Valley, GIS is used to analyze snapshots in time and to create maps that are helpful for tracking ongoing work and for future planning.

- Spatial analysis compares the difference between two data layers, and creates a "cut & fill" layer that represents changes over that time period. For example, two topographic maps (one from 1950 and one from 2000) can be compared, and any elevation changes due to grading and construction can be digitally transformed into a new layer. This new layer reveals how the elevation has changed over that fifty-year period; areas of cut, fill, and equal elevation are represented by different colors. This is useful because AUES-related items are less likely to be found in areas where a lot of soil was already removed during construction or landscaping.
- Mapping applications allow Spring Valley investigations to be efficiently tracked and planned. For example, sampling efforts can be simplified by dividing the entire site into smaller, more manageable areas. Different colors can represent properties that have and have not been sampled for arsenic, or the colors can represent high and low arsenic concentrations. In 2000, the GIS mapping applications assigned random sampling locations across properties in Spring Valley and created a field map for use during sampling. This was completed in less than a day, as opposed to the weeks required for this task if GIS had not been used.

R. Patrick presented the ESRI ArcView version 9.2 interface to show how data viewing works. Several overlapping data layers were shown, representing a variety of features such as the FUDS boundary, residential properties, trees, arsenic grids, and soil borings. Colored areas represented areas of interest, such as a range fan, ground scars, and areas of stressed vegetation. He showed a 1940 **aerial photograph** data layer and the location of a 1918 fence line based on aerial photography.

Mark Baker, Project Team Member, showed 1918 **photographs** featuring buildings related to the Spring Valley FUDS site such as storage sheds. The locations of buildings in relation to the current landscape were discussed. Many photographs do not hold enough clues to pinpoint the exact building locations, but estimates can be made. Some building locations and orientations can be lined up with features on GIS maps.

Request from N. Wells, Audience Member and ANC3D Commissioner – Could you point out Glenbrook Road and Death Valley on the map?

M. Baker complied with this request. He mentioned that "Death Valley," often referred to as "Baker Valley," refers to the region where most of the WWI chemical weapons testing took place.

Request from Lee Monsein, Community Member – Could you please overlay the house locations on this map?

M. Baker showed the locations of residences in relation to the estimated building locations.

Steve Hirsh, US EPA Region 3, noted that comparisons between house locations and WWI building locations are not precise, since the building locations are only estimates based on photographs.

L. Monsein acknowledged this limitation, and commented that the general location of houses in relation to the buildings is still interesting.

Question from Malcolm Pritzker, Community Member – What do the red dots portray? Are there are conclusions that can be drawn from these maps?

M. Baker replied that the red dots represent WWI buildings built by the U.S. Army. Not all of the buildings were located on AU property. He said that these maps provide clues to potential munitions items and debris locations. With the exception of the trench disposal pit recovered from 52<sup>nd</sup> Court, everything that the USACE has recovered that was disposed of in an organized fashion has been within the fence line of the American University Experiment Station.

Question from David Feary, Community Member – What errors are involved in locating these buildings?

M. Baker said that five different data projections from aerial photographs had been developed, and each projection matched the locations of particular features with different locations on the same property. It is challenging to piece together aerial photographs, as they are like a mosaic.

Request from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Could you show us the five projections?

M. Baker said that the projections are not available tonight, but differences in location tended to be around 10-20 feet apart.

R. Patrick showed a data layer that displays test pit and arsenic grid locations on the 4825/4835 Glenbrook Road properties. Colored rectangles represented the test pits, which were dug to determine whether any additional large disposal areas were located on the properties. Other features displayed on the map included completed arsenic grids, arsenic grids waiting for soil removal, and levels showing the amount of land cut and fill compared to the 1918 ground level. Some areas on the property have up to 20 ft of fill from 1918 ground level.

Question from N. Wells, Audience Member and ANC3D Commissioner – Is there any way to sample as deep as 20 feet below ground surface?

D. Noble said yes, it is possible to obtain deep samples from soil borings.

Question from Kent Slowinski, Audience Member – Can you overlay the historic buildings discussed earlier onto the arsenic data layer, and identify the buildings located in the areas of arsenic contamination?

M. Baker pointed out buildings of known identity, such a toxic shed, a mustard shed, an administrative building, and a drum platform. These buildings were clustered near the current Pit 3 property.

Question from M. Bresnahan, Community Member – If a munitions item is located 20 feet below ground surface, is it better to remove it or to leave it undisturbed?

M. Baker said he cannot answer that, and that higher-level scientists make those calls.

S. Hirsh noted that test pits were originally placed on the properties with the goal of finding any other burial pits if they exist. The available equipment could only dig 12 feet deep, so excavation focused on

digging as much as possible and making decisions based on what was found. The possibility remains of bringing in additional equipment to dig deeper if necessary.

Question from M. Bresnahan, Community Member –Are there particular features identified with cut and fill that are so deep that they should simply be left in place?

S. Hirsh replied that munitions will not be left in place based on current plans, but it depends on all of the factors involved in the investigation.

Tom Bachovchin, Project Team Member, added that one factor could be if contamination had the potential to extend into another medium, for example, groundwater.

M. Pritzker commented that a report from scientists, focused on M. Bresnahan's question, would be interesting. If an object or contamination located 20 feet below ground surface will not be a danger to Spring Valley residents, then excavating it should not be necessary. If residents can potentially be harmed by this object or contamination, however, it should be taken care of.

Question from D. Feary, Community Member – Can you show the groundwater monitoring wells on a GIS map?

R. Patrick said that they will be displayed during the groundwater study update later in the evening.

Request from G. Durrin, Audience Member – Would it be possible to put these GIS data layers on the website? For example, the locations of ground scars are very interesting.

D. Noble agreed that some GIS information could be made available again online. He added that if anyone is interested, a session could be scheduled during a future meeting where specific questions can be answered regarding the usefulness of GIS for the Spring Valley project.

G. Beumel, RAB Co-Chair, brought the discussion to a close due to time constraints.

## **B. Brief Progress Updates on the Geophysical Survey, Phytoremediation, the Residential Arsenic Removal Program, and the Groundwater Study**

D. Noble, USACE Co-Chair, provided brief updates on the geophysical survey, phytoremediation, arsenic removal, and the groundwater study.

### **Geophysical Survey**

At the April 29<sup>th</sup> Partnering meeting, the Partners and the Anomaly Review Board (ARB) discussed 7 residential properties with anomalies that may require intrusive investigations according to geophysical survey results. For each property, the USACE-Baltimore recommended a set of anomalies to be excavated, and the ARB carefully reviewed the recommended anomalies, provided comments, and approved the final list of anomalies selected for future intrusive investigation. The Partners and the ARB will discuss an additional 7 properties at the May 28<sup>th</sup> Partnering meeting.

The process of sorting, selecting, and prioritizing anomalies to be investigated can be included as a topic for the next RAB meeting. This discussion will include information on improvements on analytical software used to select anomalies, as well as the key determination factors for choosing anomalies for future excavation.

### **Phytoremediation**

The contract with Edenspace has been finalized for the 2008 season. Ferns were delivered and planted at Lot 15/Van Ness Street properties this week, and ferns will be planted at the Rockwood Parkway and Overlook Road properties May 13-15, 2008. Planting of ferns is expected to be completed by mid-May. Ferns will be harvested in the fall, with the intent of reducing soil arsenic concentrations to below levels of concern.

**Residential Arsenic Soil Removal Program**

Arsenic removal at residential properties remains on schedule for completion by the end of 2008. Three properties were completed in April, and initial site plans for several properties are in development or are already complete. Soil removal activities will begin shortly at Overlook Road (the 5000 block) and Fordham Road (the 3700 block). **Photographs** were shown of arsenic soil removal activities at the Quebec Street property.

**Groundwater Study**

The groundwater study plans for 2008 have been finalized as a result of recent groundwater meetings of the Groundwater Working Group, which includes the Spring Valley Partners, USGS, and Washington Aqueduct.

Seven sampling wells will be installed this summer. Three shallow wells will be installed up gradient (northeast) of the monitoring well with the highest perchlorate reading in the Glenbrook road area, PZ-4, to help focus on the source of high perchlorate levels in the shallow groundwater aquifer. PZ-4 is near Kreeger Hall on the American University campus. Four deep wells will be installed down gradient (west) of PZ-4 to help determine whether perchlorate is present in the deeper aquifer, and to identify patterns of groundwater flow based on hydrogeology. The existing shallow wells in the study area will be maintained.

A **map** of the existing groundwater monitoring wells in the vicinity of AU and Glenbrook Road was shown. Another **map** displayed the locations of the new shallow and deep wells in relation to the existing wells.

Techniques such as rock coring, video logging in the well boreholes, and mapping geological fracture zones may be used to obtain more information about the 7 new wells.

Question from D. Feary, Community Member – Have you decided to target this perchlorate plume rather than the associated plume at Sibley Hospital?

D. Noble confirmed that the groundwater study will focus on the area of perchlorate in the vicinity of the AU campus.

Question from D. Feary, Community Member – Information from deep wells will be limited to the four new wells, correct?

D. Noble confirmed that the four new deep wells will be the first deep wells installed for the groundwater study.

Question from D. Feary, Community Member – Do the shallow wells have similar depths to the existing wells?

D. Noble said yes.

Question from D. Feary, Community Member – When will the first results from the new wells be available?

Lan Reeser, USACE Project Team Member, replied that the new wells will be installed during late summer, so results will not be available until the fall or winter of 2008.

Request from Bernard Schulz, Community Member – Could you please show the well locations on the AU campus?

D. Noble pointed out the well locations for B. Schultz.

Request from G. Durrin, Audience Member – Can you show the area of perchlorate based on knowledge to date?



L. Reeser showed locations of elevated perchlorate levels in the vicinity of AU. The highest perchlorate concentration was detected in PZ-4 and additional elevated perchlorate levels are located just down gradient and west around the Glenbrook Road Pit 3 area.

### C. MMRP

D. Noble provided an update on the Glenbrook Road test pit investigations, the Pit 3 area investigations, and the upcoming AU Public Safety Building project.

#### Test Pit Investigation Monthly Update

To date, 71 test pits have been completed at the property adjacent to the Pit 3 operation on Glenbrook Road. The remaining 5 test pits at the property will be completed along with the test pits on the Pit 3 property after the Pit 3 effort is completed. These test pits are located in a tight space between the house and the retaining wall dividing the two properties and can only be accessed safely from the Pit 3 property.

11 arsenic grids have been completed, and all currently-accessible grids have been removed. Arsenic removal in the driveway area is complete and the grids are currently being backfilled. These grids are scheduled to be completed by May 19. The 1 or 2 remaining grids will be excavated when the 5 remaining test pits on the property are excavated.

He showed two **photographs** featuring the driveway excavation in relation to the retaining wall, exposed utility lines, and a large storm water drainage system that drains part of the AU campus and continues toward Glenbrook Road.

#### Pit 3 Area Project Update

The Pit 3 ECS East Extension intrusive investigation began on April 28, as planned. Approval for the East Extension was successfully obtained.

Several closed cavity items, munitions debris items, and potential AUES-related glass bottles have been recovered since resuming work at Pit 3. A small number of recovered partial glass bottles, filled with an undetermined solid white substance, were packaged and taken to a facility to be tested and cleared for agent and ricin. When the cleared bottles are returned, they will be sent to the HTW laboratory, and the Spring Valley Partners will decide what chemical analyses should be performed. Testing for a full suite of chemicals may be requested. Finally, archaeologists will examine the bottles to determine their age.

A **photograph** featured a munitions debris piece identified as an open cavity 75 mm round. This hollow, empty item was described as munition related scrap metal.

Another **photograph** showed the excavation activities inside the East Extension. The East Extension was shifted slightly to avoid the house chimney and to encase the drainage manhole. The retaining wall was removed so that the East Extension could be built, and its concrete footer was visible in the photo.

The last **photograph** showed the foundation wall of the house and concrete footer for the retaining wall, along with a concrete structure placed perpendicular to the house. This structure was completely removed, and the reason for its presence is unknown.

#### Upcoming AU Public Safety Building Project

Concurrence on the Draft Final Work Plan was received from the Spring Valley Partners.

D. Noble presented a **map** of the planned investigation areas surrounding the Public Safety Building.

The Public Safety Building investigation will not begin on May 19 as originally planned due to concerns expressed by AU regarding excavation of the debris area located behind the building. The property owner has requested that any debris extending underneath the Public Safety Building be removed during the upcoming investigation, rather than potentially extending the work into future investigations. USACE cannot provide this assurance at this time, because the purpose of this investigation is to remove

remaining debris from around the building and to characterize whether debris extends under the building. If the investigation begins as described in the current work plan, the removal of any debris extending beneath the building would require additional discussion, considerations, and extensive planning prior to continuing the excavation. The differences need to be resolved prior to start of the work.

Once the investigation starts, the intention is to complete the investigation in as timely a manner as possible. USACE and the property owner agree on the approach to excavating the planned areas located along the side and in front of the Public Safety Building. However, USACE does not want to begin the front and side yard excavations until the debris field excavation approach has been approved. Only 20 percent of the required work is in the front and side yard and the remaining 80 percent will take place in the debris area behind the building.

Comment from B. Schulz, Community Member – Has this been communicated to AU? As of today, we were still under the impression that work in the front yard area would be addressed as planned, beginning on May 19.

D. Noble responded that the investigation will not begin on May 19.

#### **IV. Community Issues**

##### **A. Health study proposal discussion**

Patrick Leibach, Legislative Assistant for Councilmember Mary M. Cheh, provided an update on the funding for the Johns Hopkins University (JHU) health study proposal.

Funding for a health report in the amount of \$250K has been approved based on the recent final budget vote. Councilmember Cheh's support for the funding will be represented during a second vote, and the approved funding is likely to remain in place. The health study budget was split between two years to ensure that the entire study would not be jeopardized if only one year could be funded, and currently only the first year of funding will be guaranteed. The funds will be appropriated to the Department of Health.

JHU has been asked to create a more detailed health study plan. The smaller scope will not be identical to the original proposal, and they will be meeting with the DC City Council Health Committee to discuss the study plan.

Comment from M. Pritzker, Community Member – I would like to give my thanks, and the thanks of the RAB committee, for the Councilmember Cheh's efforts on behalf of the community.

P. Leibach said that Councilmember Cheh appreciates the efforts of the RAB.

#### **V. Open Issues & Future RAB Agenda Development**

##### **Possible Topics for the June 10<sup>th</sup>**

- Anomaly Review Board (ARB) anomaly selection process
- Geophysical Survey Process Overview
- Monthly updates on the Geophysical Survey, Residential Arsenic Removal Program, the Groundwater Study, and MMRP Investigations (Test Pits, Pit 3, and the AU Public Safety Building)

Question from Ambassador H. Schaffer, Community Member – What is the RAB summer meeting schedule?

G. Beumel replied that no RAB meeting will be held in August. The meeting will be scheduled as usual in September.

Request from D. Feary, Community Member – Would it be possible to defer the geophysical discussion, as our resident geophysicist will not be present?

G. Beumel agreed that an overview of the geophysical survey process could be postponed, but another topic is needed to fill the timeslot.

Request from Ginny Durrin, Audience Member – A preliminary discussion about the health study could be held.

G. Beumel said that the Department of Health could be invited to attend a RAB meeting this summer to talk about the health study, but they may not be ready to discuss it yet.

Question from K. Slowinski, Audience Member – Can you provide an update on the AOI reports and the range fan?

G. Beumel noted that the range fans were discussed a while ago.

D. Noble said that an update on current AOIs could be included as an agenda topic, and G. Beumel agreed.

Question from N. Wells, Audience Member and ANC3D Commissioner – As a follow-up to the earlier discussion on buried contaminants, could we bring in a scientist to give us a briefing on the parameters that could be used?

G. Beumel was uncertain as to whether this discussion would be too early in the process.

S. Hirsh commented that a discussion on buried contaminants is a broad topic. He said that various aspects could be discussed, such as what happens when chemicals are released in the vadose and saturated zones of the subsurface, or what happens to a mustard round if it bursts near a groundwater source, or what the risks are from deep arsenic contamination. The topic needs to be developed further.

L. Monsein noted that he is not certain how contamination at different depths would be discussed; a munitions device buried at 6 feet deep versus 20 feet deep probably would not require a lecture, but arsenic located at two different depths might be a potential topic.

G. Beumel added that munitions removal is the primary issue, but he was not sure if the removal of 22 feet of soil would be conducted.

S. Hirsh added that such a deep excavation would not be considered when looking for potential munitions areas, but if the pit is already being excavated, soil and munitions removal at this depth could be completed.

Question from N. Wells, Audience Member and ANC3D Commissioner – Can you take a soil sample using rock coring?

S. Hirsh said that a sample can be retrieved out of dirt or even rock, but not much information can be gained from rock samples.

Question from Larry Miller, Community Member – If there is a depth at which excavation is not worth the effort, would records of these uninvestigated areas exist for future use? For example, if a house was knocked down and rebuilt, would detailed records be available for reference?

D. Noble confirmed that a thorough administrative record will be available.

Request from N. Wells, Audience Member and ANC3D Commissioner – A future discussion should focus on the decision-making process for declaring intrusive work complete. Although the USACE says they want thorough coverage of the area, it is my understanding that there has been recent discussion about the USACE returning to Spring Valley if more contamination is found. The Spring Valley community is concerned about property values and potential health issues, and they would like the current investigation to be the last intrusive operation that occurs in these neighborhoods.

D. Noble said that USACE has a similar goal of completing all necessary intrusive work during the current effort. USACE currently is projecting activities through 2011, but if new areas of interest are discovered this can be extended.

Comment from G. Durrin, Audience Member – An article in the May issue of Environmental Health Perspectives featured a new indoor dust sampling test used by a team of Canadian researchers. I believe that in Spring Valley, indoor air exposures have not been adequately assessed.

D. Noble said that the Spring Valley Partners could read the article to see if it is applicable.

Question from William Krebs, Community Member – What contaminants were the researchers looking for?

G. Durrin said that the sampling focused on metals, bacteria, pesticides, flame retardants, and other contaminants. In Spring Valley, arsenic levels could be assessed. She added that health scientists should look at the article, and if it is deemed relevant, it should be passed on. Perhaps it should be sent to the DC Department of Health.

Ambassador H. Schaffer noted that it should be looked as part of the new health study report.

Ginny Durrin agreed to send it on to the DC Department of Health.

Question from W. Krebs, Community Member – The house next to the current test pitting property on Glenbrook Road is currently up for sale but I thought they had not consented to an onsite survey. Has this changed now that the property is for sale?

D. Noble said that arsenic testing was completed for that property.

S. Hirsh clarified that the property referred to by W. Krebs did not allow geophysical surveys on the property.

M. Bresnahan added that a Spring Valley addendum is required for every house placed on the real estate market in Spring Valley.

Bert Weintraub, Community Member, noted that this addendum is a private real estate requirement by realtors and is not overseen by the government.

M. Bresnahan agreed, but clarified that legal requirements do exist. If a property is not sold through an attorney, these disclosures are required. GCAAR self-regulates, unlike federal requirements such as the HUD-1 and the federal lead-based paint disclosure. There is a legal requirement for disclosures.

G. Beumel said that this topic can be included in a future discussion.

## **VI. Public Comments**

No additional public comments were brought forward.

## **VII. Adjourn**

The meeting was adjourned at 9:01 PM.